Summary of Round 1 Flexibility Requests: Focus on Technical Issues in Principles 2 and 3

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Massachusetts	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Goal/purpose statement	To ensure that every student graduates from K-12 education, college and career ready	Increasing standards to achieve national and inter-national competitiveness	Increase the quality of instruction and implement a system to support continual improvement of student achievement.	Provide all Indiana children with the academic background they need to navigate a 21st century global workplace. 90-25-90 is 90% pass rate on ISTEP, 25% CCR, & 90% statewide graduation rate by 2020	Ensure all students are college- and career-ready.	Ensure readiness for college and careers, call out and remediate performance gaps, expect continuous improvement of schools and districts, reward strong performance, and aggressively address low performing schools and districts. Ultimate goal: reduce the achievement gap by half by 2017 to increase the number of students CCR.	1. Fairly and accurately measure the performance of all schools 2. Identify those Title I schools that need the most support 3. Give schools the data and tools they need to assess their needs and achieve meaningful school improvement.	Ensure that all children, regardless of life circumstance, graduate high school ready for college and careers.	All students have the potential to achieve regardless of background. Develop a system that is comprehensive, clear, unbiased, and fair	All children will graduate from high school college, career, and citizen ready by 2020.	Increasing student proficiency levels by a steady rate each year while reducing achievement gaps by a significant but realistic amount each year.
Separate System for Title I or One State System	One state system	One state system	One state system	One state system	One state system	One state system	Title I only	One state system	One state system	One state system	One state system

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Achievement Indicators	State tests: Status, growth to standard, achievement growth gap	State tests: status for all 4 subjects; percent of students making a year's worth of progress in reading and math; percent of lowest performing quartile making a year's worth of progress in reading and math	State tests: incorporating status, improvement from previous year to current year, and growth. Also examines within school gap and school to state gap for lowest quartile.	Achievement on state tests in ELA and math. Growth for the lowest 25th percentile and the other 75th percentile. In HS, achievement in English 10 and Algebra I.	State tests: Status and gap scores in reading, math, science, social studies and writing. Growth in reading and math	Proficiency gap closure on state assessments in ELA, math, and science (reduction); percent at highest (increase %) and lowest (decrease %) performance levels; and growth percentile on state assessment (met/ not met).	Proficiency on statewide assessments in reading/ language arts and math; Individual student growth; Growth gap reduction;	Percent proficient on state tests; gaps between 25th and 75th percentiles.	Proficiency, growth, growth of lowest quartile	Math index, reading index both made up of 50% status (percent proficient or above), 25% growth of all students, and 25% growth of lowest quartile.	State tests. Percent proficient and advanced is primary measure.
Grades/Subjects covered by achievement indicators	Grades 3-10 in reading, math & writing, and grades 5, 8 & 10 in science	Reading (3-10), math (3-8 plus Alg. I), writing (4, 8, 10), science (grades 5, 8 and 11, transitioning to biology)	Grades 3-8 in reading, ELA, math, science & soc. studies plus writing in grades 5 & 8 HS: 9th gr. literature, American literature, Biology, Economics, Math I, Math II, Physical Science, U.S. History, and writing	Grades 3-8 ELA and Math, English 10 and Algebra I	Grades 3-8: Reading, math, science, social studies, and writing HS = Algebra II, English 10, Biology, US History, Writing	ELA and math in grades 3-8 plus high school and science in grades 5, 8, and high school.	Grades 3-8 plus high school in reading/ language arts and math	Grades 3-8 and 11 in Language Arts Literacy and Math.	Grades 3-8 plus high school in reading/ language arts and math	Reading (3-8), Math (3-8), Science (5 & 8), Social Studies (5, 7, 8), Writing (5, 8) and EOC in Algebra I, II, Geometry, Biology, English II, English III, and U.S. History	Grades 3-8 reading/ language arts, math, and science. English II, Algebra I and Biology in high school.

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Other Indicators	ELPA, ACT, graduation rates, dropout rates	On-time graduation rate, participation and performance in advanced curricula (including industry certifications), post-secondary readiness in reading and math	Lexile score for grade 8, AP, IB, ACT, SAT in HS	4-year and 5-year graduation rates. AP and IB exams; dual enrollment college credits, industry certifications	ACT benchmarks Career definitions (MS= EXPLORE, HS =Work Keys, COMPASS, KYOTE, KOSSA , or industry certificates) Graduation rate Program review Teacher evaluation	High school graduation rates and dropout rates. Participation in ELA, math, and science assessments. Participation in ELPA.	Participation on assessments, attendance (E/M) or graduation (HS) rates	High school graduation rates.	Attendance, OTL survey, graduation rate (HS), growth in graduation rate (HS), CCR indicators = PSAT, ACT, AP, dual enrollment, and career technical certification programs	Participation index Attendance index (elem & middle) Graduation index (high)	Graduation rates.
Growth Model Used	Student Growth Percentiles with a strong emphasis on the criterion.	Teacher evaluation uses VAM that takes 2 years prior performance into account, Account-ability points are earned through a value table design (points for maintain achievement level at or above proficient or moving up one level toward proficient).	Not yet selected. Currently working with growth advisory committee to employ a normative growth model with criterion anchors.	Student growth percentiles requiring all students to achieve at least one year's worth of growth each year – more if they start more than one year behind.	Student Growth Percentiles	Student growth percentiles.	Normative model based on z-scores over two years. Predicted growth is compared to actual growth. Schools earn a growth score based on their average individual student growth Z-scores.	Student growth percentiles	VAM conditioned on both school and student	VAM	TVAAS (VAM) but only used for safe harbor.

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Combining Measures/Design Decisions	Two separate points systems for elementary and secondary. Elem: 25 points achievement (percent at or above proficient in reading, writing, math, and science), 50 points growth (in reading, writing, math and ELPA), 25 points growth gap (in reading, math, and writing). Secondary: 15 points achievement, 35 points growth, 15 points growth gap, 35 points postsecondary and readiness indicators	In elem/ middle: grades are based solely on performance in reading, math, writing and science and progress in reading and math. In HS: performance and progress on statewide assessments are weighted at 50% and college and career readiness components are weighted 50%. Scores are transformed into points which are translated into grades along with participation requirement and "gain" benchmarks for lowest 25%.	Georgia CCRPI Based on a weighted average of achievement, achievement gap closure, and progress with the highest weight placed on current achievement.	Index that provides a scale of 0-4 on each indicator and then weights the indicators separately for elementary, middle and high schools. The index is then converted into an A-F rating. For elementary/middle schools, the schools are first judged based on % proficient, and the growth score for the top 25% or other 75% can raise or of the 100% can lower that rating. ELA and math are averaged together. High school is 30% English 10, 30% Algebra I, 30% grad rate, and 10% CCR.	Schools are classified as Distinguished, Proficient or Needs Improvement using an Index that weights learner indicators 70%, program indicators 20%, and teacher/ principal evaluation 10%. Within the learning indicators, Elem=30% comes from achievement, 30% from gap, 40% growth; Middle=28% achievement, 28% gap, 28% growth, 16% CCR; HS = 20% achievement, 20% gap, 20% growth, 20% CCR, 20% graduation rate.	Progress and Performance Index using four years of data. Participation is a conjunctive indicator – if the rate is less than 95% for any subject cannot be Level 1. Points are awarded across 5 score ranges on each assessment for a composite performance index. Percentages will be awarded based on how CPI compared to goal, percent improvement in *advanced*, and percent reduction in *warning/ failing*. Growth percentages will be incorporated depending on how the school's SGP compared to the statewide median SGP overall or by subgroup. For HS, percentages will be assigned for dropout and graduation rates. The percentages for each category are averaged.	Multiple Measurements Rating (MMR) is based on two years of data on four components: Proficiency, Growth, Growth Gap Reduction, and Graduation. The four components are weighted equally.	NJ proposes a mix of conjunctive and disjunctive rules for labeling schools. There is no index or point system proposed at this time.	School receives a grade for proficiency, growth, and an overall grade that combines these two indicators with the non-achievement indicators: 40% proficiency for all students, 10% growth of highest 3 quartiles, 10% growth of lowest quartile, 12 % status graduation, 5% growth in graduation, 5% in CCR participation, 10% CCR success, 3% attendance, 5 % OTL.	OK proposes to still use a conjunctive system based on the 40 AMOs. An A+ school meets all 40 AMOs. Other grades must meet AMOs as follows: B+ = 37 C+ = 34 D+ = 31 But those numbers must include the all student category to get a +. Otherwise, other numbers are as expected (39 = A, 38= A-, etc.). Teacher and principal ratings are also included disjunctively.	Maintaining similar state system where proficiency, growth and gap are measured separately. Moving targets to LEAs.

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
						Then, four years of data are combined with greatest weight given to the most recent year. Results: 1. On track to CCR 2. Off track from CCR 3. Focus (lowest performing 20%) 4. Priority (lowest performing) 5. Priority (chronically underper-forming) PPI for all students will be used for Levels 4 & 5, while PPI for all students and high needs subgroup will be used for placement in level 1-3. Districts will be classified at the level of their lowest performing school.					

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
AMO option	C—other	A & C	A—Reduce by half % below proficient within 6 yrs	C—Other	C—Other	C—Other	A—Reduce by half % below proficient within 6 yrs	A—Reduce by half % below proficient within 6 yrs	C—Other	C—Other	C—Other
Method for setting AMO	Combine academic achievement (% of students proficient or above by percentile cut points), academic growth to standard, achievement growth gaps, and post-secondary and workforce readiness.	Four AMOs: 1) School Performance Grade Target. 2) Reading and Math Performance Target. 3) Target for Progress of Students in the Lowest-Performing 25%. 4) Benchmark Florida's Student Performance to the Highest-Performing States and Nations. This is a statewide target that compares the state's student performance on NAEP, TIMSS, PIRLS, and PISA compared to the highest-performing states and nations.	AMO is based on reducing by half the percentage of students in the "all students" group and in each subgroup who are not proficient within six years.	Calculate AMOs using school grades with the goal of all schools and sub-groups receiving an "A" or improving by two letter grades by 2020 and having all subgroups receive at least a "C" or show substantial growth. As an interim benchmark, schools must receive an "A" or improve by at least one letter grade by 2015. Annual targets are set for each school to increase steadily between baseline and 2015 and then to 2020.	Single AMO. Schools scoring below proficient (set at 70th percentile of overall school score) will be required to move a full std deviation within five years (1/5 of an SD each year) to meet their AMO. -Schools at or above proficient are required to move ½ of an SD in the same 5 years.	Refinement of Option A by using index. AMOs will be established using PPI indicators. -The state will assign credit in its performance index based on how close the district, school, or subgroup comes to meeting the AMOs in ELA, math, and science.	Continue using its existing NCLB Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measures (participation, proficiency index, and attendance/graduation rate) to calculate AMOs but with a new target of decreasing the percent of students who are not proficient in each subgroup by half within six years to better address achievement gaps.	AMOs (called performance targets) for the state, districts, schools, and subgroups are based on reducing by half the percent below proficient in equal increments each year over six years.	AMOs (called School Growth Targets (SGTs)) are benchmarked at the 90th percentile of current performance. The calculation takes the difference in the 90th percentile target and the school's current performance across five areas (total school points, reading growth of top three quartiles, math growth of top three quartiles, reading growth of lowest quartile, math growth of lowest quartile) and divides by 10.	AMOs will be based on each subgroup (and all students) across four categories: math index, reading index, participation, and school indicator (graduation or attendance depending on school level). A school may have up to 40 AMOs depending on the number of subgroups (with minimum n-size of 25 students).	TN's SEA will engage with LEAs to determine LEA targets with general goals of approximately 3-5% annual growth for all students using LEA-specific 2010-11 baselines and 6% annual gap closure across subgroups. LEAs will similarly engage with schools to establish school level AMOs. - Proficiency measures and gap closure measures will be two distinct categories of AMOs, and every LEA and school will be evaluated based on achieving or missing each.

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Details on Differentiating across Districts/Schools	Points for each sub-indicator, aggregated and assigned to one of four plans (schools) or one of five accreditation levels (districts)	The school grades system will identify schools with challenging issues between the Reward and Focus/ Priority schools. Specifically, "prevent" schools (C grade) will also receive local support. The other schools will receive differentiated recognition and support as per the flexibility requirements.	Nothing described beyond differentiated rewards, interventions, and supports based on flexibility requirements.	Nothing described beyond differentiated rewards, interventions, and supports based on flexibility requirements.	Schools below proficient are required to move a standard deviation above their current mean score on the index, while those scoring above proficient only have to move a half of an SD. The actual target depends on the starting point. Schools making AMO but not in top 10% are progressing. Schools performing above bottom 15% but not making AMO are Needs Improvement. Differentiated supports based on category.	Targets are differentiated for each district, school, and student group based on starting point in baseline year. But targets are set to reduce by half the proportion of students not on track to CCR (as measured by the Proficient cut point on the state assessment).	Targets are lower for low performing subgroups but expected annual progress is higher.	Nothing described beyond differentiated rewards, interventions, and supports based on flexibility requirements.	Use multiple measures to better target interventions and supports.	Nothing described beyond differentiated rewards, interventions, and supports based on flexibility requirements .	Same standards for all with more ambitious growth required of lower performers. However, schools and LEAs are allowed to "miss" some targets to maintain the goal of setting achievable standards. Differentiated levels of intervention for those schools who miss more than half of their targets.

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Plan for Disaggregating Student Groups	Dis-aggregates growth by minority status (non-white), poverty, disability, LEP, and by students scoring below Proficient	FL advances subgroup accountability through the inclusion the learning gains for the lowest-performing 25% of students in the school grades calculation, and through the setting of targets and public reporting of subgroup performance on AMOs. -The state shows that historically underper-forming subgroups are over-represented in the lowest performing 25% subgroup. Proposal lists specific strategies for SWDs and ELLs.	High needs students are defined as students scoring in the bottom 25th percentile in grades 3, 5, and 8 in reading and math. -The state's school and district report cards will also include flags indicating the performance of each of the 10 subgroup that will not be weighted but will serve as early warning indicators that must be addressed in improvement plans.	IN proposes using a super subgroup composed of the bottom 25% of students in order to target achievement gaps. -The state notes that while many Indiana schools have under-performing student populations, the size of subgroups frequently falls under the threshold required for accountability. -IN provides data showing that the 25% covers the at-risk subgroups without worrying about sample sizes. -The lowest 25% is comprised of 40% minority, 70% on FRPL, 28% SWD, and 10% ELL.	KY will create a non-duplicated gap group of students from NCLB subgroups. Gap group includes African American, Hispanic, Native American, Spec. Ed, Poverty, ELL. -The state will set AMOs and report out on each subgroup. -As a failsafe, if any NCLB subgroup falls more than three standard deviations below the mean, school will be identified as a Focus school.	AMOs will be reported out by traditional subgroups. MA will create a new "high needs" subgroup composed of students who are low income, have a disability, or are ELL or former ELL. Account-ability determin-ations will be made using this high needs subgroup. -The state notes that using this "high-needs" subgroup will enable the state to hold nearly 200 more schools accountable due to subgroup size. -MA will continue to issue and report disaggregated AMOs.	MN has a focus on subgroups in both AMOs and in the state's MMR system. AMOs for each subgroup have a target of reducing the rate of non-proficient students in half within six years. Additionally, subgroups (black, Asian, Hispanic, sped, ELL, and FRPL) are included in the proficiency index of MMR and are the specific focus of the growth gap reduction measure.	NJ will set AMOs for each subgroup in a school and measure and report progress toward that goal. To examine achievement gap closure within a school, they average the percent proficient in the two lowest-performing subgroups in each title I school. Then, that percent proficient is subtracted from the percent proficient of the highest performing subgroup. To be included in this analysis, the subgroup must have a minimum n=30 and represent at least 5% of the total student population.	NM focuses on the lowest quartile to target all schools with major gaps without specifying subgroups. –In Priority and Focus schools, selected interven-tions must be specifically targeted to improving performanc e in low-performing subgroups.	OK has a focus on the lowest performing quartile of students for all schools. At the high school level, there is also a focus on graduation rates of at-risk students. -The state has established school-level AMOs for each subgroup with a minimum n-size of 25, so schools will also be held accountable for this separately.	Subgroup level achievement targets are addressed through the achievement gap closure measures using % proficient as the metric. Gap closure targets are based on reducing the percentage of students below proficient in key under-performing sub-groups (non-white, economically disadvan-taged, students with disabilities, and ELLs). Each group is compared to its opposite (e.g., ELL vs. non-ELL). Report cards will also provide dis-aggregated performance for subgroups.

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Method for Identifying Priority Schools	Designed to identify lowest 5% of schools (turn-around) according to achievement, growth to standard, growth gaps, and postsecondary workforce readiness, but focuses on cut score. Currently, 4% of all schools and 6% of Title I schools.	Schools assigned a grade of F.	A school that is in the lowest 5% in terms of percent proficient on the statewide assessments of the all student groups or a graduation rate below 60% over a number of years.	Any school that receives an F or a D for two consecutive years. That currently includes all Title I schools with a graduation rate less than 60%.	Persistently low achieving schools; those in the bottom 5% of all Title I schools	All of the schools in the bottom two categories based on the PPI. At least 5% of Title I but no more than 4% of all schools statewide.	Lowest 5% based on MMR scores and Tier I SIG schools	Title I schools with the lowest percentage of students above Proficient MINUS those demonstrating a median SGP of 65 or higher PLUS those with a school-wide graduation rate below 75% PLUS those previously identified as Tier 1 or Tier 2 under the federal SIG program. Currently, NJ identified 72 (5% of Title I schools) as priority.	Schools that fall at or below the 5th percentile of performance – generally F/F schools (status/growth), but may include F/D or D/F if total point total warrants inclusion.	Three categories: 1) Schools are rank-ordered based on performance on grades 3-8 reading and math + Algebra I and English II. Each student receives 1-4 points depending on achievement level. Lowest 5% of Title I schools and equivalent non-Title I schools will be identified. 2) Any school with a graduation rate below 60% for 3 consecutive years. 3) All Tier I schools receiving SIG funds	Schools at the bottom 5% of overall performance across tested grades and subjects. Since it's the lowest 5% of all schools, the first number is equal to about 8% of Title I schools.

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Method for Identifying Focus Schools	Intended to target the next lowest 10% of schools using same measures as priority. Calling them priority improvement. Currently 9% of all schools and 17% of Title I schools.	Schools assigned a grade of D.	The 10% of schools with the largest school to state gap between high needs and not high needs groups on statewide assessments and grad rates.	Any school that is a D school and has not been identified as priority.	Bottom 10% of all Title I schools and have not met AMO for 2 years using Student Gap Group score. OR Individual gap groups in third SD below mean. OR HS with grad rate below 60% for two consecutive years.	Schools in Level 3 of PPI. Approxi-mately 15% of schools.	Lowest 10% on a modified MMR centered on the seven lowest performing subgroups focusing on proficiency and growth gap. Also includes Title I high schools with grad rates of less than 60%.	Those Title I schools not identified as priority schools with a graduation rate less than 75% PLUS the 35 Title I schools with the highest within-school achievement gap PLUS 90 schools with the lowest combined proficient rates.	Schools that have grades of D/F or F/D but whose overall grade places them in the decile above priority schools.	Schools are rank-ordered based on performance of the lowest three student groups in the state only on grades 3-8 reading and math + Algebra I and English II. Each student receives 1-4 points depending on achievement level. Lowest 5% of Title I schools and equivalent non-Title I schools will be identified.	The ten percent of schools with the largest achievement gaps, subgroup performance below a 5% proficiency threshold, or high schools with graduation rates less than 60%.

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Sanctions/ supports for Priority and Focus Schools	Schools must prepare turnaround plans. Priority schools must submit plans to CDE for review. Parental notification, choice, SES, targeted school improvement are still used. Priority and focus schools are on a 5 year clock. State law provides options for research-based strategies, including the use of a lead partner, reorganizing, seeking recognition as an innovation school, using a school management organization, converting to a charter school (or changing the nature of the charter for a current charter	Priority schools must select one of the State Turnaround Models, which could include: replace the principal; adopt a new governance structure; reassign or replace the majority of instructional staff whose students' failure to improve can be attributed to their effectiveness; refocus the curriculum; close the school; reopen as a charter school; contract with a private entity to run the school; or implement a hybrid model of these. Focus schools must implement interventions approved and monitored by	GA will use onsite school improvement specialists to work with schools on data analysis, determination of root causes, development of goals and improvement actions. Turnaround interventions include assessing the performance of the principal and replacing him/her if necessary; screening teachers that are transferred to the school; analyzing data and root causes; requiring collaborative planning; participation in required professional learning; implementation of the CCSS ELA and math frameworks;	Technical Assistance Teams (TAT) will conduct quality reviews of schools to recommend interventions tied to The Mass Insight Readiness Model. The interventions will center on readiness to learn, readiness to teach, and readiness to act and may include changes in staffing, scheduling, or performance incentives. A school turnaround process will be implemented in which an external management team is assigned to operate either part or all of a school using existing school funding. Other Priority	Schools must use diagnostic reviews to create individualized school and district improvement plans. Schools will be provided with Education Recovery specialists for professional development and coaching. Schools will receive technical assistance from regional centers, short-term data cycle monitoring, and access to the online AdvancED planning tool.	Schools with the lowest ratings will be subject to intensive state monitoring and oversight. Priority schools must develop a turnaround plan in collaboration with stakeholders to be approved by the Commissioner. The plan must address district capacity, provide a blueprint for school intervention, and set annual measurable goals.	Focus schools must perform a diagnostic review to determine interventions to best meet the needs of students in low performing subgroups, develop a plan, and receive state approval. The Statewide System of Support (SSOS) will provide support through sharing of best practices and provision of technical assistance. Priority schools will also receive data analysis, goal-setting, professional learning communities, curriculum alignment, time audits, and a professional development	NJ will use diagnostic review for Priority and Focus schools and use the Regional Achievement Centers (RACs) to provide support. The RACs will help these schools develop individualized school improvement plans based on school needs. The state proposes to use quality school reviews (QSRs) in Priority and Focus schools to evaluate the school climate and culture; leadership; standards, assessment and intervention system; instruction; use of time;	Priority schools are required to work with their LEAs and the SEA to develop an intervention plan based on data that addresses all seven turnaround principles The state will request data to support the selected interventions and will require schools to shift funding to tools that yield a better return on investment if performance stagnates. Focus and Priority schools will undergo an instructional audit before their site visits to examine systems to support teacher effective-ness. They will be	Priority schools will use the WISE online planning tool based on the state's Nine Essential Elements for school improvement to develop an improvement plan with state monitoring. Focus schools will place an emphasis on improving performance of the subgroup(s) that are underper-forming. Additionally, LEAs with focus schools will be required to set aside Title I funds to provide school choice (minimum of 5%). The state will form student support teams to conduct diagnostic	The state's turnaround models include: TDOE-run Achievement School District (ASD), LEA-run "innovation zone", four SIG turnaround models (as approved by TDOE); and, LEA-led school improvement planning processes. All priority schools will be served through one of the first three strategies by 2014-15

	school), or another significant intervention.	the LEA. These could include staff changes, provision of job-embedded professional learning; extension of the learning day; and use of data to inform instruction.	and the identification and support of students at risk of not graduating. Schools must use funds previously reserved for SES to implement a supplemental tutoring program	schools receive partners to work with leadership to implement targeted improvements. The turnaround process has a key focus on family and community engagement as a lever for generating support for turnaround and sustaining improvement.			needs analysis. Priority schools must conduct time and curriculum audits to assess their use of instructional time and aligned instruction. Schools with low graduation rates will be required to use an early warning system to identify and intervene with students at risk for dropping out.	use of data; staffing; and family and community engagement.	assigned state support specialists to lead them through a self-evaluation process and provide technical assistance on research-based intervention strategies based on the results of these assessments.	reviews in all priority schools and selected focus schools to provide additional analysis and support to low-performing schools. Schools in LEAs deemed incapable of supporting the priority school will be turned over to a central support LEA.	

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Exiting priority or focus status	CO has set cut points for improvement plans at 47% of framework points to exit priority status and 62.5% for focus schools. Focus schools who meet or exceed on Academic Growth Gaps and Disag-gregated Graduation Rates will have made significant progress and exit.	Improve to a grade of C or higher.	Schools no longer falling in the lowest 5% will be exited from priority and no longer in the 10% will be exited from focus, although support will continue for both types of schools for 2 more years.	Achieve a C or higher rating for two consecutive years.	Exit priority by meeting AMO for 3 consecutive years and no longer in bottom 5%. Exit focus by moving gap group out of lowest 10%, or moving the subgroup at the 3rd SD below the mean above that cut and meet AMO for 2 years, or grad rate higher than 60% plus meet AMO for 2 years.	To exit priority status, school must increase the CPI in ELA and math for both all students and high needs students over three years; decrease the percentage of all & high needs students in warning/ failing in ELA and math; maintain a median SGP of 40 or higher in both subjects; and meet graduation rate targets in high school. To exit Focus status, a school must score at Level 1 or 2 on the PPI.	To exit priority status, schools must score above the lowest quartile of Title I schools on the MMR for 2 years in a row. To exit focus schools must score above the lowest quartile of Title I schools for 2 years in a row using performance on the growth gap reduction measure.	Schools will exit priority when they are no longer in the bottom 5% based on the afore-mentioned criteria or based on demonstrated progress in implementing interventions aligned to turnaround principles.	Schools will exit priority when they receive a grade of D/F or F/D or higher for 2 years in a row. To exit focus, schools must receive a grade of D/C or C/D or higher for two years in a row.	To exit priority status, a school must earn A, B, or C on the grading system. A focus school must also earn A, B, or C AND make AMOs in all student groups to exit.	To exit priority, schools must not be in the next "priority" list identified 3 years later. Or a school passes its achievement AMOs 2 years in a row. To exit focus, schools must not be in the next "focus" list identified 3 years later. Or a school passes its gap closure AMOs 2 years in a row.

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Method for Selecting Reward Schools	Reward schools are based on three years of data and include a rating exceeds on achievement, meets or exceeds on growth gap and rating of meets or exceeds on graduation rate. Separate award for those demonstrating highest rates of sustained student longitudinal growth.	Schools receiving a grade of "A" or improving one letter grade from the previous year.	Top 5% of Title I schools based on performance of all students on statewide assessments. Top 10% of Title I schools based on achievement gap closure.	Schools that earn an A two years in a row. Elem/middle schools that show high growth in the bottom 25% will be high progress schools. High schools that shows significant improvement of the bottom 25% passing English 10 and Algebra I will be high progress.	Highest performing schools in the 95th percentile or above on overall score and met AMO. Also recognize 90th percentile and met AMO. High progress schools have top 10% improvement over 2-year period and met AMO.	Schools will be identified for demonstrating high achievement, making strong progress, or narrowing proficiency gaps. Demonstrated through high PPI for both aggregate and high needs groups although focus on different parts of the PPI will be different for the three different types of commendation awards.	Top 15% of Title I schools using the MMR.	High Performing: Schools with 90% of all students proficient whose subgroup performance is also in the top 10% for each subgroup. For high schools, they must also have a graduation rate above 90%. High Progress: SGP score of 65 or higher.	Schools that receive an A/A (status/growth) – meaning scoring at or above the 95th percentile on status and 90th percentile on student growth targets. They may consider A/B or B/A separately.	All schools will be rank ordered using an index system that codes 1-4 for a student's achievement level and weights the assessments at 30% reading, 30% math, and 40% other subjects. The top 10% who are not failing in any other criteria will be reward schools. Schools can also show significant progress through a value table approach.	Schools in the top 5% of overall performance and schools in the top 5% of fastest growth.
Rewards for Reward Schools	Public recognition plus monetary reward	Eligible to receive funding through the FL School Recognition Program.	Public recognition and monetary rewards.	Public recognition by state officials, bonus points on their application for an excellence in teaching grant. Disseminate best practices.	Reward schools will be used as demonstration sites. Financial rewards (if available); Professional growth opportunities; public recognition.	Schools with high ratings will receive public recognition, and have the opportunity to engage in regional activities and partnerships with Focus schools.	Public recognition by the governor and commissioner.	Financial incentives; work with partner organizations to share best practices.	Public recognition, model of reform, school leaders will mentor other leads, potential monetary rewards.	Increased autonomy, public recognition, opportunity to serve as advisors to SEA.	Public recognition, financial rewards, chance to serve as state leaders, and opportunity to apply for grant to share best practices more widely

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Overview of Using Achievement in Teacher Evaluation System	Developed by districts and must meet state requirements, including 50% from achievement	Weights student growth at 50% of the evaluation and differentiates effectiveness with four performance categories: 1. Highly effective 2. Effective 3. Needs improve-ment 4. Unsatis-factory 50% comes from other factors, including parental feedback.	Includes a value-added/growth model that determines how much each teacher contributes to student learning. Extra credit for reducing achievement gap. Also includes teacher, student, parent and climate surveys. Evaluation tool and process will also be included.	Growth data is used in tested grades in ELA and math to categorize teachers are highly effective, effective, improvement necessary or ineffective	Consists of student growth, professional growth, artifacts, student/ parent voice, peer observation, teacher self-reflection, classroom observation.	Two annual judgments on teachers' professional practice and impact on student learning. Professional practice uses classroom observations, artifacts of instruction, contribution to professional culture, and student feedback. Impact on student learning is judged through growth results and at least one other district-wide measure of achievement.	Workgroup is still developing recommend-ations for an evaluation model.	Teacher evaluation is based on equal parts practice (inputs) and student learning (outputs). Inputs are primarily measured through classroom observation, although other measures such as teacher portfolios or student/ parent surveys must be approved by NJDOE. Outputs are measured by student growth on state assessment, school performance measure, and other performance measures.	Currently uses a binary licensure system but will be moving to an evaluation system that incorporates student achievement as a major component resulting in five tiers of performance. Expect system will be based 50% on VAM, 25% on observations, and 25% locally adopted multiple measures.	35% of teacher evaluation is based on state standardized test. 15% on other objective achievement measure, tbd. Qualitative measures make up the other 50% and can include: Organizationa l and classroom management skills; Demonstratio n of effective instruction; Evidence of continuous improvement; Interpersonal skills; Leadership skills.	Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM) uses an evaluation based on 50% observation, 35% on student growth and 15% on an achievement measure.

TOPIC	Colorado	Florida	Georgia	Indiana	Kentucky	Mass.	Minnesota	New Jersey	New Mexico	Oklahoma	Tennessee
Including Teachers of Non-Tested Subjects/Grades	Not addressed	Use school district assessments to measure student growth.	DOE-approved district-level achievement growth measures and student learning objectives that are specific, measurable, and limited to one school year	IN still working to provide guidelines on other tests and data that can be used.	Not specifically addressed.	First judgment is the same; second relies solely on district measure of achievement.	Considering teacher portfolios.	Performance measures must still make up 50%. LEAs must identify measures of performance capable of generating growth or mastery scores for all subjects and grades. Could come from an array of sources such as SLOs or other tests.	Plan to create a "transition model" for those in non-tested subjects that includes 50% multiple measures and 25% based on the school grade. The other 25% will remain based on observations.	The quantitative component shall involve an assessment using objective measures of teacher effectiveness including student performance on unit or end-of-year tests. Other options include developing additional state assessments, developing a list of other measures of student data, or using school-wide data.	Growth for teachers in tested subjects is based on individual growth. Growth for teachers in non-tested subjects is based on school growth.
Timeline for Implementation of Teacher Evaluation System	Pilot Fall 2011, implement spring 2012	Growth model will be applied to 2011-12 data. Decisions about teachers will start Summer 2014.	Pilot in 2012 and imple-mented in RTT school districts in 2012-2013 and statewide in 2014-2015.	Training on model begins in 2012-2013 school year.	Small pilot in 2011-2012, statewide pilot in 2012-13, state-wide imp-lementation in 2013-14	RTTT districts implement by 9/2012; all districts implement by 9/2013.	Complete model in 2012-2013. Pilot in 2013-14 and full statewide implementa-tion in 2014-15.	Statewide pilot in 2012-13; complete implementatio n in 2013-14.	Pass legislation in June 2012; Phased implementa-tion begins in 2013-14 and becomes aligned with compensation in 2015-16.	Complete criteria in 2011-2012 school year and pilot system in 2012-2013.	Already implement-ed.